

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, and 21-30 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, and 21-30 stand rejected. Claim 29 has been cancelled, and Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, and 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Palm (U.S. Pat. No. 5,183,357), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Palm in view of Lacey (EP 0344005) or Dawdy (U.S. Pat. No. 3,671,061). In view of the amendments herein, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Claim 1 which has been amended to clarify the mandrel has a first reduced diameter section adjacent to the perpendicular shoulder portion. Additionally, Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation that the mandrel includes break-neck adjacent to a second portion. The second portion has a diameter greater than the diameter of the first portion

Claim 21 has been amended to include the limitation the mandrel has a break-neck and a separate reduced diameter section adjacent the shoulder engagement surface.

Applicant notes that while some of the references may show rivets having a mandrel adjacent to the head with a reduced diameter, the reduced portion represents the break-neck portion of the mandrel. Claim 1 contains both a reduced diameter portion and a separate break-neck portion. As such, Applicant submits that the references do not teach the limitations as claimed.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Dated: October 30-02

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CAE/lf-s/smb

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Christopher A. Eusebi, Reg. No. 44,672